

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 18, 2007.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Claims 1-5 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Breeden et al. (US 2006/0206856 A1).

### **II. Summary of Applicants' Response**

The present Reply cancels claims 2-5, amends claim 1, and adds new claims 6-31, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1 and 6-31. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### **III. Response to Rejections**

Independent Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A system, comprising:

- one or more compilers, wherein the compilers support mixing and nesting of languages within a source file;

- an extensible multi-language compiler framework, wherein the compiler framework provides a language-independent source code editor with information about the source file, comprising: signatures of classes defined by the source file, errors found in the source file, stack of nested languages at any point in the source file, and information exposed by any languages; and

- a language-independent source code editor, wherein the editor communicates to the compiler framework using language-independent metadata.

Independent Claim 1 defines a system that includes one or more compilers, an extensible multi-language compiler framework, and a language-independent source code editor. Dependent claims 6-32 add additional features to the embodiment described in Claim 1. Breeden does not appear to disclose the features defined in the claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Breeden. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn. Dependent Claims 6-31 depend from Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with regards to Claim 1, dependent Claims 6-31 are also patentable. Dependent Claims 6-31 add their own features, which render them patentable in their own right.

#### IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2007

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253